

CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTIONS FOR MULTICONTRACTIONS AND AUTOMORPHISMS OF THE UNIT BALL

CHAFIQ BENHIDA AND DAN TIMOTIN

ABSTRACT. A *multicontraction* on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is an n -tuple of operators $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We obtain some results related to the characteristic function of a commuting multicontraction, most notably discussing its behaviour with respect to the action of the analytic automorphisms of the unit ball.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space; a *multicontraction* is an n -tuple of operators $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. A theory of dilation and models for this type of operators has been developed by Gelu Popescu in [8, 9] and a series of subsequent papers. There is no commutativity assumed there, and the isometric dilation obtained is related to the Fock space and to representations of the Cuntz algebra.

Starting mainly with [1], interest has developed around the case T is formed by commuting operators. In particular, in the recent paper [4], which is actually the starting point for this note, a notion of characteristic function is introduced for commuting tuples, and in a particular case it is shown that this is a complete unitary invariant. One computes also, in terms of the characteristic function, the curvature introduced by Arveson [2]. Although some of the results therein follow from the noncommuting case of Popescu, it is not the case with all of them; moreover, even when it is, the direct approach might be instructive.

This note investigates further the characteristic function of a multicontraction. In Section 2 we remind the main definitions and notations. Section 3 contains some variations around the results in [4]. In Section 4 we investigate a general form of fractional transform, of which the characteristic function is a particular case. The main applications are obtained in Section 5, where one investigates the relation of the characteristic function to the automorphisms of the ball applied to a multicontraction. Here formulas similar to the Moebius transform of a single contraction are obtained. This is connected to the homogeneous operators considered by Misra et al [6].

After this paper was completed, we have learnt that further work on closely related subjects has independently been done by Bhattacharyya, Eschmeier and Sarkar [5]. We will point out, when the case appears, the relation between our results and [5].

2. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATIONS

If $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are two Hilbert spaces, and $C : \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$ is a contraction, one defines the *defect operator* $D_C = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1} - C^*C)^{1/2} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1)$ and the defect space $\mathcal{D}_C = \overline{D_C \mathcal{E}_1} \subset \mathcal{E}_1$.

Suppose $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^n$ is a commuting multicontraction; that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

This is the same as requiring that the row operator $T = (T_1 \ \dots \ T_n) : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction. (We will currently denote with the same letter T the multioperator and the associated row contraction.) Accordingly, we have the operators $D_T = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}^n} - T^*T)^{1/2}$ and $D_{T^*} = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - TT^*)^{1/2}$, and the spaces $\mathcal{D}_T = \overline{D_T \mathcal{H}^n} \subset \mathcal{H}^n$, $\mathcal{D}_{T^*} = \overline{D_{T^*} \mathcal{H}} \subset \mathcal{H}$.

For further use, for a multiindex $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we shall denote $|\alpha| = |\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|$, and $T^\alpha = T_1^{\alpha_1} \dots T_n^{\alpha_n}$.

If, for $z \in \mathbb{B}^n$ (the unit ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$), the operator $\mathbf{z} : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{z} = (z_1 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \ \dots \ z_n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}),$$

then $\mathbf{z}$ is a strict contraction, and thus $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{z}T^*$ is invertible. We may then define

$$(2.1) \quad \theta_T(z) = -T + D_{T^*}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{z}T^*)^{-1} \mathbf{z}D_T : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T^*}.$$

Thus $\theta_T(z)$ is an analytic contraction valued functions defined on $\mathbb{B}^n$. In [4], where $\theta_T(z) : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ is introduced, it is called the *characteristic function* of T , and it is proved (in the commuting case) that it is a multiplier of the corresponding Hardy–Arveson spaces. (For a single contraction all these notions appear in [13].)

According to a standard terminology introduced in [13] for the case of a single contraction, we say that two analytic functions $\Theta : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$, $\Theta' : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}'_1, \mathcal{E}'_2)$ *coincide* if there exist unitary operators $\Omega_i : \mathcal{E}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{E}'_i$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $\Omega_2 \Theta(z) = \Theta'(z) \Omega_1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{B}^n$.

The *Hardy–Arveson* space $\mathbf{H}$ is equal to the Hilbert space of analytic functions on $\mathbb{B}^n$ with reproducing kernel $k(z, w) = \frac{1}{1 - \langle z, w \rangle}$. The monomials z^α ($z \in \mathbb{B}^n, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$) form a complete orthogonal family, and we have [1, Lemma 3.8]

$$\|z_1^{\alpha_1} \dots z_n^{\alpha_n}\|^2 = \frac{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_n!}{(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n)!}.$$

Also, for $\mathcal{E}$ a Hilbert space, we denote $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbf{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$; thus $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{C})$.

The *standard multishift* $S = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ on $\mathbf{H}$ is defined by $S_i f = z_i f$. Again in [1] one shows that S is a commuting multicontraction, and $D_{S^*} = P_0$, where P_0 denotes the orthogonal projection onto the constant functions. We will use the same notation S for the corresponding operators $(S_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}})$ acting on $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$.

If $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E}), \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E}^*))$ is an operator that commutes with the standard multishift, then A is uniquely defined by its restriction a to $\mathcal{E}$; we will denote then $A = M_a$. One can also view a as a function from $\mathbb{B}^n$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}^*)$, by writing $a(z)(\xi) = a(\xi)(z)$.

Now, if T is an arbitrary multicontraction, we can define a completely positive map

$$(2.2) \quad \rho_T : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$$

by $\rho_T(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n T_i X T_i^*$, and denote, as in [4], by $A_\infty(T) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ the strong limit of the decreasing sequence of positive operators $\rho_T^k(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}})$. The next theorem appears in [4]; most of its ingredients are already present in [1].

Theorem A. *If T is a commuting contractive tuple of operators on $\mathcal{H}$, then there exists a unique bounded linear operator $L : \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ satisfying*

$$(2.3) \quad L(f \otimes \xi) = f(T) D_{T^*} \xi$$

for all f polynomial, $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$. The adjoint operator $L^ : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ is given by*

$$(2.4) \quad (L^* h)(z) = D_{T^*}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - z T^*)^{-1} h.$$

These operators satisfy

$$(2.5) \quad L S_i = T_i L, \quad S_i^* L^* = L^* T_i^*.$$

We have the identities

$$(2.6) \quad L L^* + A_\infty(T) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}},$$

$$(2.7) \quad L^* L + M_{\theta_T} M_{\theta_T}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}.$$

When no confusion is possible, we will usually denote simply A_∞ instead of $A_\infty(T)$.

Finally, we remind a dilation result from [1]. A *spherical operator* $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ is a commuting tuple of normal operators such that $Z_1 Z_1^* + \dots + Z_n Z_n^* = \mathbf{1}$.

Theorem B. *If T is a multicontraction, there is a (essentially uniquely defined) standard minimal dilation of T of the form $S \oplus Z$, where S is a multishift on $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$, while Z is a spherical operator. We have $Z = 0$ iff $A_\infty(T) = 0$.*

A few words are in order concerning the relation to the noncommuting case considered by Popescu in [8, 9] and subsequent papers. When the contractions T_i do not commute, it is necessary to introduce, instead of the Hardy–Arveson space $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$, the Fock space

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}^n \oplus (\mathcal{E}^n)^{\otimes 2} \oplus \dots \oplus (\mathcal{E}^n)^{\otimes m} \oplus \dots.$$

One can identify then $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$ with the subspace of $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ formed by the symmetric tensors; suppose then that $\pi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the orthonormal projection onto this subspace. The defect spaces of a noncommuting multicontraction are defined in a similar manner, and the characteristic function of T introduced by Popescu in [9] corresponds to an operator $\mu_T : \Gamma(\mathcal{D}_T) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ which commutes with the creation operators in the Fock space. The relation with the commuting case is then the formula $M_{\theta_T} = \pi_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \mu_T|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T)}$. For other connections between the commuting and noncommuting cases, one can see [11], as well as the recent extensive paper [10].

3. CLASSES OF MULTICONTRACTIONS

By means of the operator A_∞ defined above, we can define some classes of multicontractions, similar to the ones that appear in [9] in the noncommutative case.

Definition 3.1. The multicontraction T is called

- *pure (or C_0) if $A_\infty = 0$;*
- *C_1 if $\ker A_\infty = \{0\}$;*
- *completely noncoisometric (c.n.c) if $\ker(\mathbf{1} - A_\infty) = \{0\}$.*

The next result is an immediate consequence of Theorem A.

Proposition 3.2. (i) [4] T is pure iff L^* is an isometry. In this case T is unitarily equivalent to the commuting tuple $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_n)$ on $\mathbb{H}_T = \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T^*) \ominus M_{\theta_T}(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T))$ defined by $\mathbb{T}_i = P_{\mathbb{H}_T} S_i|_{\mathbb{H}_T}$.

(ii) T is c.n.c. if and only if L^* is one-to-one. In this case T^* is uniquely determined by the second equality in (2.5).

The following lemma has been proved for the noncommuting case in [8] (see Remark 2.7 therein).

Lemma 3.3. Suppose T is a commuting multicontraction.

(i) $\ker A_\infty$ is invariant with respect to T^* , and the compression of T to $\ker A_\infty$ is pure.

(ii) $\ker(\mathbf{1} - A_\infty)$ is invariant with respect to T^* and, if $\hat{T}$ is the compression of T to $\ker(\mathbf{1} - A_\infty)$, then $\mathcal{D}_{\hat{T}^*} = \{0\}$.

We can also characterize multishifts by means of their characteristic function.

Proposition 3.4. If T is pure, then T is unitarily equivalent to the multishift S iff $\theta_T \equiv 0$.

Proof. In Theorem A, if S is the multishift, then L in (2.3) becomes the identity. It follows then from (2.7) that $M_{\theta_T} = 0$, and thus $\theta_T \equiv 0$.

Conversely, if $\theta_T \equiv 0$, then from Proposition 3.2 it follows that $\mathbb{H}_T = \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T^*)$, $\mathbb{T}_i = S_i$, and T is unitarily equivalent to $\mathbb{T}$. $\square$

Definition 3.5. An analytic function $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ is called:

- *inner* if $M_\Phi : \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$ is a partial isometry;
- *outer* if $M_\Phi : \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$ has dense range.

The following characterizations of classes of commuting multicontractions, by means of their characteristic functions, are similar to those obtained in [13] for one contraction and in [9] for noncommuting contractions.

Theorem 3.6. Suppose T is a c.n.c. multicontraction on $\mathcal{H}$. Then:

- (1) T is pure iff θ_T is inner.
- (2) T is of class C_1 iff θ_T is outer.

Proof. (1) If T is pure, then L is a coisometry, and thus L^*L is a projection. From (2.7) it follows that $M_{\theta_T} M_{\theta_T}^*$ is also a projection; thus M_{θ_T} is a partial isometry and θ_T is inner.

Conversely, if M_{θ_T} is a partial isometry, then (2.7) implies that L is a partial isometry, and then from (2.6) it follows that A_∞ is a projection. Since T is c.n.c., we must have $\ker(\mathbf{1} - A_\infty) = \{0\}$. Thus $A_\infty = 0$, which means that T is pure.

(2) Note that $\ker A_\infty = \{0\}$, is equivalent, by (2.6), to $\ker(\mathbf{1} - LL^*) = \{0\}$. But it is easy to see (for any bounded operator L , actually) that this last relation is equivalent to $\ker(\mathbf{1} - L^*L) = \{0\}$. By (2.7), this is the same as $\ker(M_{\theta_T}^*) = \{0\}$, or θ_T outer. $\square$

To end the section, let us note that the model provided by Proposition 3.2 (i) for pure contractions can be extended up to a certain point to c.n.c. multicontractions, in a manner similar to [13] (for a single contraction) or to [9] (for noncommuting multicontractions). We give only some indications in this direction, mostly in order

to obtain an extension of Proposition 3.4. More details, including an investigation of the model space, can be found in [5].

Remember that $\mathcal{D}_{M_{\theta_T}} = \overline{(I - M_{\theta_T}^* M_{\theta_T})^{1/2} \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T)} \subset \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T)$. Consider the space $\mathcal{K}_T = \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \oplus \mathcal{D}_{M_{\theta_T}}$ and the two mappings $v : \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_T$, $v_* : \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_T$, defined by

$$(3.1) \quad v(f) = M_{\theta_T} f \oplus D_{M_{\theta_T}} f, \quad v_*(f) = f \oplus 0.$$

It is easy to check that v, v_* are isometries, that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{K}_T = v(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T)) \vee v_*(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})),$$

and that $v_*^* v = M_{\theta_T}$; consequently $v^* v_* = M_{\theta_T}^*$. Define $\mathbb{H}_T = \mathcal{K}_T \ominus u(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_T))$.

If $k \in \mathbb{H}_T$, and $k \perp v_*(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}))$, we must have $k = 0$ by (3.2). Thus the projection $P_{\mathbb{H}_T}$ onto $\mathbb{H}_T$ has dense range when restricted to $v_*(\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}))$. Also, if $f \in \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$, then

$$\|v_* f\|^2 = \|P_{\mathbb{H}_T} v_* f\|^2 + \|v^* v_* f\|^2 = \|P_{\mathbb{H}_T} v_* f\|^2 + \|M_{\theta_T}^* f\|^2.$$

On the other hand, by (2.7) for any $f \in \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ we have $\|L f\|^2 + \|M_{\theta_T}^* f\|^2 = \|f\|^2$. Therefore, the map $L f \mapsto P_{\mathbb{H}_T} v_* f$ is an isometry. We have just noticed that its range is dense in $\mathcal{H}$; but its domain is also dense in $\mathbb{H}_T$ by Corollary 3.2. We obtain then a unitary $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_T$, defined by the formula

$$(3.3) \quad \Phi(L f) = P_{\mathbb{H}_T} v_* f.$$

Now, since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - P_{\mathbb{H}_T} = v v^*$, we have, using (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} v_*^*(\Phi L f) &= v_*^* P_{\mathbb{H}_T} v_* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})} - v_*^*(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - P_{\mathbb{H}_T}) v_* \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})} - v_*^* v v^* v_* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})} - M_{\theta_T} M_{\theta_T}^* = L^* L. \end{aligned}$$

Again, since the range of L is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, it follows that

$$(3.4) \quad v_*^* \Phi = L^*.$$

We may then define a multioperator $\mathbb{T}$ on $\mathbb{H}_T$ by requiring that $v_*^* \mathbb{T}_i^* k = S_i^* v_*^* k$. Applying (3.4) and (2.5), we have

$$v_*^* \mathbb{T}_i^* \Phi h = S_i^* v_*^* \Phi h = S_i^* L^* h = L^* T_i^* h = v_*^* \Phi T_i^* h;$$

since v_*^* is one-to-one, this shows that $\mathbb{T}$ is a multicontraction unitarily equivalent to T . Using this unitary equivalence, one can prove, on the lines of Theorem 4.4 in [4], that the characteristic function is a complete unitary invariant for c.n.c. contractions.

Theorem 3.7. *Two c.n.c. contractions are unitarily equivalent if and only if their characteristic functions coincide.*

By Lemma 3.3 (ii), this is a natural framework for the extension of [4, Theorem 4.4]. Note also that an alternate proof of Theorem 3.7 can be obtained by using the noncommutative theory of [9].

As a consequence, we can obtain a generalization of Proposition 3.4.

Corollary 3.8. *If T is c.n.c., then T is unitarily equivalent to the multishift S iff $\theta_T \equiv 0$.*

Remark 3.9. The main drawback of Theorem 3.7 is that not all contractive multipliers coincide with characteristic functions of commuting multicontractions, and, contrary to the noncommuting case of [9], we do not know of a simple way to characterize those that do. A simple example is given by the null characteristic function: $\theta : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ defined by $\theta(z) = 0$ for all z coincides with a characteristic function if and only if $\dim \mathcal{E}_1 = \infty$. Indeed, it is obvious that in this case coincidence is equivalent to equalities of the dimensions of the domain and of the range. On the other hand, Corollary 3.8 implies that, if θ coincides with θ_T , then T has to be the multishift S on some space $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$. But then $\dim \mathcal{D}_{S^*} = \dim \mathcal{E}$ (and is thus arbitrary), while (for $n \geq 2$) $\dim \mathcal{D}_S = \infty$. This follows immediately from the fact that $\dim \ker \mathcal{D}_S = \infty$, since it contains, for instance, all elements in $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$ of the form $(z_2 f) \oplus (-z_1 f) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=3}^n 0$ (with $f \in \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{E})$).

4. FRACTIONAL TRANSFORMS

It is useful to regard characteristic functions of multicontractions in a larger context, namely as a particular case of fractional transforms. This section is a development of some results in [3].

Let $A, W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ be contractions such that the inverse $(I + WA^*)^{-1}$ exists; define the operator $\Psi_A(W) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ by the formula

$$(4.1) \quad \Psi_A(W) = A + D_{A^*}(I + WA^*)^{-1}WD_A$$

The inverse exists if for example $\|WA^*\| < 1$. A related operator is

$$(4.2) \quad \psi_A(W) = \Psi_A(W)|_{\mathcal{D}_A} : \mathcal{D}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{A^*};$$

note also that $\Psi_A(W)|_{\mathcal{D}_A^\perp} = A|_{\mathcal{D}_A^\perp}$, and it maps this subspace unitarily onto $\mathcal{D}_{A^*}$.

We will use repeatedly the formulas

$$(4.3) \quad \Psi_{-A}(-W) = -\Psi_A(W), \quad \psi_{-A}(-W) = -\psi_A(W).$$

Lemma 4.1. (i) *We have the relations*

$$\begin{aligned} I - \Psi_A(W)^* \Psi_A(W) &= D_A(I + W^*A)^{-1}(I - W^*W)(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_A, \\ I - \Psi_A(W)\Psi_A(W)^* &= D_{A^*}(I + WA^*)^{-1}(I - WW^*)(I + AW^*)^{-1}D_{A^*}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\|\Psi_A(W)\| \leq 1$, and, if W is an isometry (or coisometry), then $\Psi_A(W)$ and $\psi_A(W)$ are isometries (or coisometries, respectively).

The lemma is proved by straight computation. As a consequence, we can define isometric operators $\Omega : \mathcal{D}_{\Psi_A(W)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_W$ and $\Omega_* : \mathcal{D}_{\Psi_A(W)^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{W^*}$ by

$$(4.4) \quad \Omega D_{\Psi_A(W)} x = D_W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_A x,$$

$$(4.5) \quad \Omega_* D_{\Psi_A(W)^*} x = D_{W^*}(I + AW^*)^{-1}D_{A^*} x.$$

Remark 4.2. There is an important case when we can strengthen these statements. Suppose that $W_0 : \mathcal{D}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$ and $I + W_0 A^* : \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$ is invertible. (Note that $A(\mathcal{D}_A) \subset \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$ and $A^*(\mathcal{D}_{A^*}) \subset \mathcal{D}_A$.) Then, if $W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ is defined by $W = W_0 P_{\mathcal{D}_A} + A P_{\mathcal{D}_A^\perp}$, then $I + WA^*$ is invertible, $\mathcal{D}_W \subset \mathcal{D}_A$, $\mathcal{D}_{W^*} \subset \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, and Ω, Ω_* are actually unitary. In this case formulas (4.4) and (4.5) yield identifications of the defect spaces of $\Psi_A(W)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose the operators $I + VA^*$, $I + WA^*$, $I + \Psi_A(V)W^*$, $I + V\Psi_A(W)^*$ are all invertible. Then, if Ω, Ω_* are defined by (4.4) and (4.5), we have*

$$(4.6) \quad \Omega_* \psi_{\Psi_A(W)}(V) = \psi_W(\Psi_A(V))\Omega.$$

It should be noted that Ω and Ω_* depend only on A and W (and not on V).

Proof. Since the two terms of (4.6) act on $\mathcal{D}_{\Psi_A(W)}$, in order to check it we have to apply them to $D_{\Psi_A(W)}x$. The proof is a rather tedious computation for which we give only some indications.

One checks first the two formulas

$$\Psi_A(W)D_A = D_{A^*}(I + WA^*)^{-1}(W + A)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}D_{A^*}(I + VA^*)^{-1} \\ = D_{W^*}(I + AW^*)^{-1}D_{A^*}(I + V\Psi_A(W)^*)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using them, one shows that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega_* \psi_{\Psi_A(W)}(V)D_{\Psi_A(W)}x \\ = D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}(\Psi_A(V)D_A - D_{A^*}(I + VA^*)^{-1}D_{A^*}W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_A). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, writing explicitly the left term in (4.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_W(\Psi_A(V))\Omega D_{\Psi_A(W)}x \\ = WD_W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax + D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}\Psi_A(V)(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax \\ - D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}\Psi_A(V)W^*W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}\Psi_A(V)W^*W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax \\ = -D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax + WD_W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_W(\Psi_A(V))\Omega D_{\Psi_A(W)}x \\ = D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}[\Psi_A(V)(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax + W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax] \\ = D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}[\Psi_A(V)D_Ax + (-\Psi_A(V)A^* + I)W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_Ax] \\ = D_{W^*}(I + \Psi_A(V)W^*)^{-1}[\Psi_A(V)D_A - D_{A^*}(I + VA^*)^{-1}D_{A^*}W(I + A^*W)^{-1}D_A]x. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this last equality with (4.7), one obtains the desired equality. $\square$

The relation with the characteristic function is obtained by noting first that, for $z \in \mathbb{B}^n$, the operator $\mathbf{z} : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a strict contraction, and thus $1_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{z}T^*$ is invertible. Then, by comparing (4.2) and (2.1), we see that

$$(4.8) \quad \theta_T(z) = \psi_{-T}(\mathbf{z}).$$

5. INVOLUTIVE AUTOMORPHISMS OF THE UNIT BALL

A main interest of formula (4.8) is that it allows to make the connection between characteristic functions and automorphisms of the ball applied to multicontractions.

The involutive automorphisms of the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$ are defined [12] by

$$\phi_\lambda(z) = \lambda - \frac{s_\lambda}{1 - \langle z, \lambda \rangle} (z - (1 - s_\lambda)P_\lambda z),$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}^n$, $s_\lambda = (1 - |\lambda|^2)^{1/2}$, and P_λ is the projection onto the space spanned by λ . Among the properties of these maps, we note that ϕ_λ is involutive, that is, $\phi_\lambda \circ \phi_\lambda = 1_{\mathbb{B}^n}$, that it maps the unit ball onto the unit ball, and the unit sphere onto the unit sphere.

The relation with the previous section is given by the next proposition, whose proof is a direct computation.

Proposition 5.1. *If we identify $\lambda, z \in \mathbb{B}^n$ with strict contractions in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C})$, then*

$$\phi_\lambda(z) = \Psi_\lambda(-z) = \psi_\lambda(-z).$$

Denote $\lambda = \lambda \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$; then λ is a strict contraction. If $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a multicontraction, then λT^* is a strict contraction, and we may define $\Psi_\lambda(-T) = \psi_\lambda(-T)$.

In case T is commutative, $\phi_\lambda(T)$ is defined by the analytic functional calculus, and it is in turn a commuting row contraction. Moreover

$$\phi_\lambda(T) = \Psi_\lambda(-T).$$

There are several properties of the multicontraction T that are also inherited by $\phi_\lambda(T)$. The first one can be proved directly.

Proposition 5.2. *With the above notations, $\ker(1 - A_\infty(T)) = \ker(1 - A_\infty(\phi_\lambda(T)))$. In particular, T is c.n.c., if and only if $\phi_\lambda(T)$ is c.n.c.*

Proof. Denote $\phi_\lambda(T) = R = (R_1, \dots, R_n)$. Since all R_i are analytic functions in $T_1, \dots, T_n$, all subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ invariant to T are also invariant to R . But then the relation $\phi_\lambda(R) = T$ implies that R and T have the same invariant subspaces, and the same is true for T^* and R^* .

Suppose then that $\mathcal{K} = \ker(1 - A_\infty(T))$ is not contained in $\ker(1 - A_\infty(R))$. Since the elements of this last subspace are characterized by the fact that $\rho_R^k(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ for all k (ρ_R as defined by (2.2)), there exists $x \in \ker(1 - A_\infty(T))$ and a first index $K \geq 1$ for which $\rho_R^K(\mathbf{1})(x) \neq x$. Since $\rho_R^k(\mathbf{1}) \leq \mathbf{1}$ for all k , and $\mathcal{K}$ is invariant to R^* , it follows that we can find $y \in \mathcal{K}$, $y \neq 0$ (of the form $y = R_{i_1}^* \dots R_{i_{K-1}}^* x$), such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \|R_i^* y\|^2 < \|y\|^2$. On the other side, $y \in \mathcal{K}$ implies $\sum_{i=1}^n \|T_i^* y\|^2 = \|y\|^2$.

Consider now the multioperators T', R' , which are the compressions of T and R respectively to $\mathcal{K}$. It is easy to see that $R' = \phi_\lambda(T') = \Psi_\lambda(-T')$. But the definition of $\mathcal{K}$ implies that T' , as a row contraction operator, is a coisometry. By Lemma 4.1, R' should also be a coisometry, which contradicts the existence of y .

We have thus proved that $\ker(1 - A_\infty(T)) \subset \ker(1 - A_\infty(R))$. But then $\phi_\lambda(R) = T$ implies that we actually have equality. $\square$

According to (4.4) and (4.5), we have operators $\Omega : \mathcal{D}_{\phi_\lambda(T)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_T$ and $\Omega_* : \mathcal{D}_{\phi_\lambda(T)^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$; moreover, since Remark 4.2 applies, Ω, Ω_* are actually unitary maps. They provide identifications of the defect spaces of $\phi_\lambda(T)$; what is more

interesting, they can be used in order to obtain a formula for the characteristic function of $\phi_\lambda(T)$.

Theorem 5.3. (i) *The operators Ω and Ω_* are unitaries.*

(ii) *$\theta_{\phi_\lambda(T)}$ coincides with $\theta_T(\phi_\lambda(z))$.*

Proof. (i) follows from the fact that we can apply Remark 4.2 ($A = \lambda$ is a strict contraction). As for (ii), by Proposition 5.1, formulas (4.8) and (4.3), we have

$$\theta_{\phi_\lambda(T)}(z) = \theta_{\Psi_\lambda(-T)}(z) = \psi_{-\Psi_\lambda(-T)}(\mathbf{z}) = -\psi_{\Psi_\lambda(-T)}(-\mathbf{z}).$$

But Proposition 4.3 applied to the case $A = \lambda$, $V = -\mathbf{z}$, $W = -T$ says that $\psi_{\Psi_\lambda(-T)}(-\mathbf{z})$ (and thus also $-\psi_{\Psi_\lambda(-T)}(-\mathbf{z})$) coincides with $\psi_{-T}(\Psi_\lambda(-\mathbf{z}))$. Note that the unitaries Ω, Ω_* in Proposition 4.3 do not depend on V , and thus in our case the unitaries implementing the coincidence do not depend on z .

Finally, applying again Proposition 5.1 and formula (4.8), we obtain

$$\psi_{-T}(\Psi_\lambda(-\mathbf{z})) = \psi_{-T}(\phi_\lambda(z) \otimes \mathbf{1}_\mathcal{H}) = \theta_T(\phi_\lambda(z)),$$

which ends the proof. $\square$

Theorem 5.3 is the generalization of the well known formula for the characteristic function of a Moebius transform of a single contraction [13, VI.1.3]. However, the definition of the automorphism of the ball makes ϕ_λ involutive, and thus $\phi_\lambda^{-1} = \phi_\lambda$. The change of sign in the usual definition of the Moebius transforms accounts for the apparition in [13] of a slightly different formula.

Note also that a weaker result along the lines of Theorem 5.3 appears in [5].

As a first application, we obtain a partial extension of the relation between the spectrum and the characteristic function that exists for single contractions [13]. Recall (see, for instance, [7]) that, for a commuting multioperator $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$, one can define its *right spectrum* by:

$$\sigma_r(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - \lambda_i)(T_i - \lambda_i)^* \text{ is not invertible}\}.$$

Proposition 5.4. *If $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}^n$, then $\lambda \in \sigma_r(T)$ iff $\theta_T(-\lambda)$ is not surjective.*

Proof. Note that, since $\sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^*$ is invertible if and only if $(T_1 \cdots T_n)$ is surjective, we have

$$\sigma_r(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^n : ((T_1 - \lambda_1) \cdots (T_n - \lambda_n)) \text{ not surjective}\}.$$

Since T maps unitarily $\mathcal{D}_T^\perp$ onto $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}^\perp$, it follows that $0 \in \sigma_r(T)$ iff $\theta_T(0)$ is not surjective. Thus the claim is true for $\lambda = 0$. For other values of λ , since, by the spectral mapping theorem,

$$\sigma_r(\phi_\lambda(T)) = \phi_\lambda(\sigma_r(T)),$$

we have $\lambda \in \sigma_r(T)$ iff $0 \in \sigma_r(\phi_\lambda(T))$ (note that $\phi_\lambda(\lambda) = 0$). This is equivalent to $\theta_{\phi_\lambda(T)}(0)$ not surjective. Since, by Theorem 5.3, $\theta_{\phi_\lambda(T)}(0)$ is unitarily equivalent to $\theta_T(\phi_{-\lambda}(0))$, and $\phi_{-\lambda}(0) = -\lambda$, the proposition is proved. $\square$

Remark 5.5. Naturally, a corresponding result can be proved for the *left spectrum* $\sigma_l(T) := \sigma_r(T^\sharp)$, where $T^\sharp = (T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$. This would however require the assumption that $T^\sharp$ is a multicontraction. If one would want to deduce a consequence about the *Harte spectrum* $\sigma_H(T) = \sigma_r(T) \cup \sigma_l(T)$, one should assume *both*

T and $T^\sharp$ multicontractions, which is a rather unnatural hypothesis (for instance, it is not satisfied by the multishift for $n \geq 2$).

The next consequence concerns the multishift.

Proposition 5.6. *If S is a multishift and $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}^n$, then $\phi_\lambda(S)$ is also a multishift, of the same multiplicity.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.2 $\phi_\lambda(S)$ is a c.n.c. multicontraction, while Theorem 5.3 implies that its characteristic function is identically zero. We may then apply Corollary 3.8 to conclude that $\phi_\lambda(S)$ is a multishift. The equality of the multiplicities follows from the equality of the defect spaces of S and $\phi_\lambda(S)$, as given by Theorem 5.3, (i). $\square$

We can also study the relation with the model spaces.

Lemma 5.7. (i) *If Z is spherical, then $\phi_\lambda(Z)$ is also spherical for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}^n$.*

(ii) *If the multicontraction V is a minimal dilation for T , then $\phi_\lambda(V)$ is a minimal dilation for $\phi_\lambda(T)$.*

Proof. (i) follows immediately from the functional calculus for commuting normal operators. As for (ii), one sees easily that $\phi_\lambda(V)$ is a dilation for $\phi_\lambda(T)$, and that the space spanned by the powers of $\phi_\lambda(V)$ applied to $\mathcal{H}$ is contained in the one spanned by powers of V . On the other side, ϕ_λ is involutive, which gives the opposite relation. $\square$

Proposition 5.8. (i) *If the standard minimal dilation of T is $S \oplus Z$, then the standard minimal dilation of $\phi_\lambda(T)$ is $\phi_\lambda(S) \oplus \phi_\lambda(Z)$.*

(ii) *If T is pure, then $\phi_\lambda(T)$ is pure.*

(iii) *If T is of class C_1 , then $\phi_\lambda(T)$ is of class C_1 .*

Proof. (i) and (ii) follow immediately from Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.7. As for (iii), we will apply Theorem 3.6. If T is of class C_1 , then θ_T is outer. To show that $\theta_{\phi_\lambda(T)}$ is also outer, note first that by Theorem 5.3 it is enough to show that $\theta_T(\phi_\lambda(z))$ is outer. Denote by C_λ the operator $f \mapsto f(\phi_\lambda(z))$; it is invertible, since $C_\lambda^2 = \mathbf{1}$. Then

$$M_{\theta_T(\phi_\lambda(z))} C_\lambda = C_\lambda M_{\theta_T},$$

whence it follows that, if M_{θ_T} has dense range, then $M_{\theta_T(\phi_\lambda(z))}$ also has. $\square$

6. GENERAL AUTOMORPHISMS

The general form of an automorphism α of $\mathbb{B}^n$ is

$$\alpha = \omega \circ \phi_\lambda,$$

for $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}^n$, and ω a unitary map of $\mathbb{C}^n$ (see, for instance, [12, Theorem 2.2.5]). We may then complete the results of the previous section by taking into account the action of the unitary ω ; since we identify $\mathbb{C}^n$ with row $1 \times n$ matrices, and regard T as a row operator, it is natural to consider the action of ω as matrix multiplication to the right.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $T' = T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega)$. Then $\rho_{T'} = \rho_T$, while $\theta_{T'}(z)$ coincides with $\theta_T(z\omega^*)$.*

Proof. We can write $\rho_T(X) = T(X \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^n})T^*$; then

$$\rho_{T'}(X) = T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega)(X \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^n})(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega^*)T^* = T(X \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^n})T^* = \rho_T(X).$$

As concerns the defect spaces and operators, we have $D_{T'^*} = D_{T^*}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{T'^*} = \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$, while $D_{T'} = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega^*)D_T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{T'} = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega^*)\mathcal{D}_T$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{T'}(z) &= -T' + D_{T'^*}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{z}T'^*)^{-1}\mathbf{z}D_{T'} \\ &= -T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega) + D_{T^*}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega^*)T^*)^{-1}\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega^*)D_T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega) \\ &= \theta_T(z\omega^*)(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega), \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is proved. $\square$

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose $T' = T(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \omega)$. Then:*

- (i) T' is c.n.c. (C_1, C_0) iff T is c.n.c. (C_0, C_1) , respectively).
- (ii) If T is a multishift, then T' is a multishift of the same multiplicity.

Proof. The results in (i) are immediate consequences of the equality $\rho_{T'} = \rho_T$, while for (ii) we have to use, besides Lemma 6.1, Corollary 3.8. $\square$

Gathering the results in Propositions 5.2, 5.6, 5.8, Lemma 6.1, Corollary 6.2, and Theorem 5.3, we obtain a general result concerning the action of an analytic automorphism of the unit ball on a multicontraction.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose $\alpha : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$ is an analytic automorphism, while T is a multicontraction. Then:*

- (i) $\alpha(T)$ is c.n.c. (C_1, C_0) iff T is c.n.c. (C_0, C_1) , respectively).
- (ii) $\theta_{\alpha(T)}$ coincides with $\theta_T \circ \alpha^{-1}$.
- (iii) If T is a multishift, then $\alpha(T)$ is a multishift of the same multiplicity.

In [6] the notion of *homogeneous n -tuples* of operators is introduced in a general context. In our case, a multicontraction T is homogeneous if $\alpha(T)$ is unitarily equivalent to T for all α automorphism of $\mathbb{B}^n$. Consequently, Theorem 6.3, (iii) says that *the standard multishift is homogeneous*.

The authors thank J. Sarkar for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Arveson: Subalgebras of C^* -algebras. III. Multivariable operator theory. *Acta Math.* **181** (1998), 159–228.
- [2] W. Arveson: The curvature of a Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_d]$, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **96** (1999), 11096–11099.
- [3] Ch. Benhida, D. Timotin: Finite rank perturbations of contractions, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **36** (2000), 253–268.
- [4] T. Bhattacharyya, J. Eschmeier and J. Sarkar: Characteristic function of a pure contractive tuple, *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, to appear.
- [5] T. Bhattacharyya, J. Eschmeier and J. Sarkar: On completely non coisometric tuples and their characteristic functions, preprint.
- [6] G. Misra, N.S. Narsimha Sastry: Homogeneous tuples of operators and representations of some classical groups, *J. Operator Theory* **24** (1990), 23–32.
- [7] V. Müller: *Spectral Theory of Linear Operators*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel–Boston–Berlin, 2003.
- [8] Gelu Popescu: Isometric dilations for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **316** (1989), 523–536.
- [9] Gelu Popescu: Characteristic functions for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *J. Operator Theory* **22** (1989), 51–71.

- [10] Gelu Popescu: Constrained multivariable operator theory, preprint, arXiv:math.OA/0507158.
- [11] B.V. Rajarama Bhat, T. Bhattacharyya, S. Dey: Standard noncommuting and commuting dilations of commuting tuples, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **356** (2004), 1551–1568.
- [12] W. Rudin: *Function Theory in the Unit Ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Springer-Verlag, New York–Berlin, 1980.
- [13] B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias: *Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space*, North-Holland Publishing Co, 1970.

UFR DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ DES SCIENCES ET TECHNOLOGIES DE LILLE, F-59655
VILLENEUVE D’ASCQ CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: `Chafiq.Benhida@math.univ-lille1.fr`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. BOX 1-764, BUCHAREST
014700, ROMANIA

E-mail address: `Dan.Timotin@imar.ro`